

bate. However, the question would be discussed upon another occasion, whether the Government liked it or not.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL did not consider the hon. gentleman's remarks at all called for. He (Mr. Campbell) did not try to prevent debate. Every hon. gentleman had an opportunity of speaking, but none rose. Now appeals were made to him, for leave to speak. He had nothing to do with it.

Hon. Mr. CHRISTIE repeated his complaint of unfairness on the part of the Government, whom he charged with a desire to choke off discussion upon a question with respect to which they felt feeble and apprehensive. He complained, moreover, of the unwillingness of the Government to produce information required by hon. gentlemen. He himself had to ask twice for certain papers; although they had a majority, a sinister movement would not serve them.

Hon. Mr. FERRIER could not understand why the last speaker should blame the Government. When the amendment was put, why was the matter not discussed? Hon. gentlemen who did not speak then were themselves to blame. We were disputing now, after having decided the matter. It was now beyond the House. Hon. gentlemen should have opposed the amendment at the proper time.

After further discussion, participated in by Hon. Messrs. Letellier de St. Just, Aikins, Christie, Campbell, and Wark,

Hon. Mr. CHRISTIE gave notice that on Monday he would move that a Committee be appointed to take into consideration all the matters relative to the granting of the contract of the Canadian Pacific Railway, previous and posterior to its being signed, with power to send for persons, papers and records.

The motion of Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST for adjournment was declared carried.

MONDAY, April 21.

The SPEAKER took the chair at three o'clock.

A question of order, understood to be connected with the Speaker's decision on the right of a member to speak on a question after the adoption of such an amendment as that of Hon. Mr. Campbell's, to Hon. Mr. Macpherson's Pacific Railway resolutions of Friday last, was brought up and discussed for over an hour. The matter was said to have been left in abeyance.

After routine business,

Hon. Mr. AIKINS laid on the table the

report of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries for the past year.

Hon. Mr. DICKEY gave notice of a motion for information as to whether any arrangement exists between the Government or Department of Public Works and Sir Hugh Allan or the Montreal Telegraph Company to give him or them the exclusive right of erecting and working telegraph lines along the line of the Intercolonial Railway, and as to those liable for the expense of erecting a telegraph line between Truro and Amherst, the paying for messages, etc.

ENQUIRIES.

Hon. Mr. WILMOT said it would be in the recollection of hon. members that a Bill was passed in another branch of the Legislature last session, and which afterwards came before this House, for the repeal of the Insolvency law, but to which a large majority of the Senate were opposed, and as this law would expire in September next, and as petitions on the subject had come in from nearly every Board of Trade throughout the Dominion, the question arose whether action should be taken with a view to the continuance of this law. He could speak for the Province he came from, and say it would be very undesirable to allow matters to go back to the state of things existing prior to the passage of these laws, when a preference might be given to any particular individual in view of a failure, to the depriving of the creditors, generally, of a fair division of the property of the debtor. Therefore, in the interest of the creditors, as well as of the honest debtor, he thought the law ought to be re-enacted, and more particularly looking to the present state of financial affairs. He noticed in reports from New York and other places, that the rate of interest had ranged lately from 7 to 365 per cent per annum, and considering the state of the money market in Montreal and London, and the high rates there prevailing, also, he thought it would be most unfortunate if the country should be left without an insolvency law. Therefore he asked the question of which he had given notice. "Whether it is the intention of the Government to submit to Parliament during the present session, a measure for the continuation of the existing insolvency laws."

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL said the circumstances to which his hon. friend had alluded, that there was a vote passed in another place, in opposition to the views subsequently elicited in this branch of